



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/394,840	09/13/1999	VOLKER BAUM	P99.1620	4964

7590 11/29/2004

SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE  
Patent Department  
6606 Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606-6473

EXAMINER
----------

HEWITT II, CALVIN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/394,840

Applicant(s)


BAUM ET AL.

Examiner

Calvin L Hewitt II

Art Unit

3621



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Status of Claims***

1. Prosecution on the merits of this application is reopened on claims 1-20 and considered unpatentable for the reasons indicated below: New art has been found.
2. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sansone et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,008,827 in view of Abumehdi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,743,662.

As per claims 1 and 11, Sansone et al. teach a method for remotely updating data in a service device comprising:

- a service device (column/line 11/10/45-11/23) memory for forming a status report (abstract; column 9, lines 5-49)

- establishing a communication between the device and a remote data center and transmitting said status report to the remote data center (abstract; figures 1 and 3A-B; column 9, lines 8-15)
- the data center forming a recommendation based on the status report regarding the service device memory (column 9, lines 45-54)
- loading service data, communicated from the data center to the service device, according to the recommendation (column 9, lines 49-54)

However, Sansone et al. do not specifically recite checking the recommendation for feasibility at the device. Abumehdi et al. teach loading a service data recommendation to a service device from service device memory (figure 1; column 3, lines 35-58) wherein the device checks the service data recommendation for feasibility prior to loading the service data recommendation from memory (column 4, lines 48-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Sansone et al. and Abumehdi et al. in order to allow postage meter (i.e. service device) operators to obtain postage rate data (i.e. date sensitive service data recommendation) prior to, and not use until, the data is in effect ('662, column 4, line 57-61).

As per claims 2, 3, 12 and 13, Sansone et al. ('827, figure 1) and Abumehdi et al. ('662, figure 1) teach service devices as postage meters that comprise memory for storing current rate data (i.e. service data). Abumehdi et al.

teach additional memory for storing updates ('662, figure 1; column 3, lines 29-50), determining feasibility based on current service data stored in memory (column 4, lines 50-55), transmitting new service data along with a conversion date ('662, column 4, lines 37-53) and automatically updating service data according to the conversion date ('662, column 4, lines 37-61). Abumehdi et al. also teach conveying error messages to a user if a check results in non-feasibility and storing service data in memory if feasibility results ('662, column 4, lines 36-61) while Sansone et al. teach collating device memory by a data center in order to make a service data recommendation ('827, column 9, lines 45-55) and forming request data in a service device ('827, column 9, lines 8-11). Regarding claim 3, Sansone et al. teach a user/service device making a data request and the data center being able to provide for (e.g. recommendations) said request ('827, abstract; column 8, lines 35-68; column 9, lines 45-55), hence there exists a correspondence between the service device memory and data center memory. Abumehdi et al. teach automatically updating service data according to the conversion date ('662, column 4, lines 37-61). To one of ordinary skill, making such a process periodic would have been an obvious automation of a known process in light of the art of updating rate tables as they apply to government and/or regulated business processes (*In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 192, 196 (CCPA 1958)).

As per claims 4-6 and 14-16, Abumehdi et al. teach determining whether to update memory stored in a service device by comparing an effective or conversion date with a date stored (distinct from memory that stores service data) in the service device. To one of ordinary skill, this feature of the Abumehdi et al. system represents an electronic calendar module that continuously emits signals identifying a current date, otherwise the new rate information (service data) would never be loaded ('662, column 4, lines 37-61).

As per claims 7 and 17, Sansone et al. ('827, figure 1; column 8, lines 54-58) and Abumehdi et al. ('662, figure 1) teach service devices as postage meters that comprise memory for storing current rate data (i.e. service data). Hence, both references disclose service devices that perform postage calculations based on postage rates.

As per claims 10 and 20, Sansone et al. teach a data center loading data from a remote data center to a service device over a high-speed communication link (abstract; figure 1; column 4, lines 60-63; column 7, lines 15-21). Specifically, Sansone et al. disclose the use of "suitable data transmission techniques" in order to transmit data over high-speed networks (column 15, lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a well-known method such as data compression in order to more efficiently manage traffic over said network.

Art Unit: 3621

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8, 9, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sansone et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,008,827 and Abumehdi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,743,662 as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Freestone et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,943,657.

As per claims 8, 9, 18 and 19, Sansone et al. and Abumehdi et al. teach systems and methods for updating rate and other postal data in a postage meter ('827, abstract, figures 1 and 4, column 8, lines 53-58; column 9, lines 45-55; '662, abstract; column 4, lines 36-61). However, neither Sansone et al. nor Abumehdi et al. specifically recite a plurality of proposals in a list. Freestone et al. teach storing a plurality of rates and listing the most meaningful first (column 8, lines 23-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Sansone et al., Abumehdi et al. and Freestone et al. in order to allow update rate data to be processed in a more efficient manner by avoiding the implementation of a "sort" or "search" routine to find the next rate update.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Bass et al. teach updating postal scales via a telephone network
- Koether teaches a communication network for monitoring and updating a plurality of remote devices
- Dlugos et al. teach storing obsolete and new rate data in multiple memory locations
- Dlugos et al. teach updating postal equipment via telecommunications network

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Calvin Loyd Hewitt II whose telephone number is (703) 308-8057. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
c/o Technology Center 2100



Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 (for formal communications intended for entry and  
after-final communications),


or:

(703) 746-5532 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5,  
2451 Crystal Drive, 7th Floor Receptionist.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application  
should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)  
308-1113.

Calvin Loyd Hewitt II  
November 18, 2004



JAMES P. TRAMMELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600